

9TH EDITION

PRICE 20c

JOCKO-HOMO HEAVENBOUND



JOCKO-HOMO HEAVENBOUND

BY B. H. SHADDUCK, PH. D.

AUTHOR OF

"Puddle to Paradise"

"The Tomstool Among the Tombs"

5TH EDITION

PRICE 20 CENTS

JOCKO-HOMO HEAVENBOUND



**JOCKO-HOMO
HEAVENBOUND**

BY B. H. SHADDUCK, PH. D.

AUTHOR OF

"PUDDLE TO PARADISE"

"THE TOADSTOOL AMONG THE TOMBS"



BEFORE THE PARADE STARTED

This squat "ancestor" with doubtful table manners, is presumed to be the dam or sire of the race. When we found "it" in a magazine, this crude poem of our pedigree was only about three drops of ink removed from glorious manhood. They called it "Scientific Symbolism." Elsewhere, this hairy poem is called all sorts of names ending in "-ism." When "Mother Goose" scientists fix up a poultice like this, they OMIT the prose DETAILS. I have asked the artist to add the brutal facts that put a "D" before evolution. The Bible says, "He that sitteth in the heavens will laugh." No wonder!

FAIR WARNING!

3

This book is under a ban.

From certain advertising columns it is excommunicated.

The agent for nine church papers has written the author: "We have been requested to refrain from accepting further advertising of 'Jocko-Homo' for any of our papers."

You may have three guesses as to why the readers are thus protected from Hille "J-Homo" and not from some other things.

Before reading the book, you may guess it is obscene, but be advised that one of these same papers, about the same time, gave a free notice of a book by the female, Elsie Glyn.

If you guess it tells lies, that could hardly be sufficient cause, since another of these papers printed a free notice of Van Loom's alleged history of the Bible.

Perhaps it makes a joke of the Bible. That would hardly be considered a serious fault by publishing interests that recently sent out Sunday school literature (1924) which managed somehow to get the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan without acknowledging a physical miracle.

We would not question the intellectual honesty of these eminent men. More than most men guess, our opinions are the products or by-products of tutors and tooters. How can a man-made prophet deliver other than a skull-made message? In the School of the Wilderness, John the Baptist learned to be the medium of the Holy Spirit. Had he taken his cup to a school where the Bible was filtered through a pint or two of brains, sweetened and made into catnip tea, he could never have introduced himself as "the voice." If Paul's message had been the "best thought" of his time (Gal. 1:12), he would have been a popular itch specialist (2 Tim. 4:3) and would have led popular movements to hang the heaven sign over the broad way.

Just one question for "modernists" who have outgrown the Bible and sneeringly call it our "paper pope." Have you improved on Pentecost?

TO DOUBTING BELIEVERS—MORE OR LESS

X

The first edition of this book met with every sort of reception but one; no one, known to the author, offered to refute it.

Some have complained that it showed scant courtesy to Christian evolutionists. I reckon every man my comrade, who accepts the whole Bible for what it claims to be. I harbor only love for any man who fosters no past or present insincerity. If you are not open to conviction and are a little gunshy, this is the place to lay the book down.

My father fed me on Darwinism and called it infidelity. To me, it was a blinding curse; now when the self-appointed committee on Bible renovation brings in the former outcast as a wet nurse for a mongrel theology, I remember that I have met the old "gal" before. I regret that I know of no way to heave a brick at the old squaw and seem perfectly polite to the enamored bystanders.

If you have an open mind or a willingness to expose the fallacy of this book, here are seven little questions for beginners:

1. If it were conceded that there were man-like animals before Adam and animal-like men after the fall, cross-breeding and corruption of the race described in Genesis, how could that disprove that God made an image-man without proxy and forthwith?

2. Does evolution continue to function, so that we may some day develop horns, hoofs, shell, wings, gizzard, wheels or smokestack?

3. Ought it to continue so that the strong may crush the weak?

4. Among earth's teeming billions, is any creature developing a wart, wen, wrinkle, blister, freckle or pimple, into an organ or limb?

5. Why is it that 99.99999% of life continues in one cell form, in defiance of evolution?

6. What law would put a tail on a gobbler's nose and a whisk broom on his breast?

7. What law would handicap destructive creatures as does poison itch in the bite of blood sucking insects (provoking destruction); or the 17 years of helpless infancy for "locusts"?



SCIENCE? RELIGION? FOLLY?

Before you bring "railing accusation" against this picture-parable of "modernism," consider that it portrays what passes for both science and religion with many people.

There was recently unveiled with solemn ceremony, in a New York "church," a "graven image" called "The Chrysalis." Since satan imitates sacred things, it might better be called "The Modernist Madonna." It is the image of a youth coming forth from a gorilla. Since these "worshippers" profess faith in some sort of heaven, the artist has added what is presumed to be the next stage of evolution, and **BEHOLD THE FOLLY OF IT ALL!**

JOCKO — HOMO

(Monkey Man)

THE HEAVEN BOUND KING OF THE ZOO.

By B. H. Shadduck, Ph.D.

A

LIBERALISM

In all ages there have been people who found the religion of Jehovah not sufficient *democratic* for their liking. God did not put his laws and his revelations to a *vote*. He did not consult them in making the original; they do not consult him in making the amendments. It is the history of all religions that men try to shape their lives to their faith or shape their faith to fit their ambitions and desires. Men who do not like a "meddlesome" God, find too much *iron* and not enough *rubber* in the Word of God for their comfort. The elaborate criticisms that add elasticity to revelation are now heralded under the labels of modernism.

RATIONALISM.

For centuries, another school of thought, making equal claim to scholarship and freedom from superstition has held the Bible up to mockery and ridicule, boldly proclaiming deliverance from its pall of ignorance and tradition.

DARWINISM.

Yet another school of thought arose and framed a theory that makes man the culmination of a selfish, merciless strug-

gle that began with an invisible speck of life in the slime of the sea a billion years ago. This theory excused God from any direct and personal responsibility. For all they knew or *cared*, God is a myth and man an *accident*. It remained for later engineers to hook the loose end onto some sort of hope-so heaven and presume a puddle-to-paradise pilgrimage.

WHERE THREE STREAMS MEET

It was inevitable that in time these three streams should flow together, and as in the case of rivers that unite, the currents of each keep to their own side of the valley *for a time*; so the drifting churchmen, in an effort to save their face and some of their faith, profess a separate identity and shy not a little at the crowd that goes with them. After robbing the infidel thinkers of their theory of ape relationship on which they had spent a life time, they tied the word "*Theistic*" on it, like a can on a dog's tail, that they may wean it and shoo it away from the company that it has been in. Their embarrassment is like that of the man who stole a pig and the old sow followed him home. As yet, they are uncertain how much responsibility for the process is to be put on God.

TRUTH IN THE SHOW WINDOW.

In every false teaching there is an element of truth. Certain well known facts are wrested from their logical connections and put in the *show window* and the credulous passer-by is easily deceived as to what the shop really turns out. We know, of course, that all creatures born or hatched are in form, habits and mentality, a blend in variable degrees of the contributions of all their ancestors. We know that in the selfish struggle for food, shelter and mates and against fire, famine, frost, flood and foe, ALL *must* perish and *some* will perish *first*. These are *show window* facts. What we protest against is that, back of the public display, in the department of speculation, they juggle with an eternity of time, an infinity of mystery and the infinitesimal of life and label the theories that are changed as many times as Jacob's wages—

"science." They agree on but one thing, that is the *predetermined* conclusion that one kind of creature may be transmuted into another kind.

SPECULATION OR REVELATION.

There is a modification of species recognized in the Bible and the barnyard. For all I know to the contrary, the oft repeated assertion that our horses developed from little horses, may be true; but when the evolutionary fairies put a marsupial sack on a reptile in one age and take it off in the next, in their efforts to make a man, I question the infallibility of human speculation rather than divine revelation.

An organ may develop in succeeding generations *after* it begins to function, but evolution utterly fails to suggest a law that could possibly bring it from nothing to a stage where it could be of service. Take for instance, the poisoning equipment of a rattlesnake. It would upset evolution to admit that it arrived at any useful development *suddenly* and only an unsound mind could reason that for a million years, it *gradually*, persistently developed itself into a complicated mechanism that would in the end be useful. Two fangs must be hollow, have hinges, muscles, automatic squirt gun arrangement, poison glands and an instinct to know how to use them. The boasted law of evolution is, that organs not used tend to wither and disappear. Before it was useful, it was a nuisance. The consummate folly of it is, that our ancestors lost their tails *because they did not use them* and the rattler developed a rattle box on one end and a deadly contraption on the other *before he could use them*. Ask some evolutionist why twice as many rattles are needed the second year.

Were there man-like races before Adam? I don't know. The Bible does not say there were not. *If there were*, they need not help and they could not hinder God in making his *image-man* as he says he did.

Old bones only prove that brute races and families have passed and will pass. Rudimentary organs prove that equip-

Eight

ment not used, be it a wing or a soul, becomes atrophied. **THIS IS NOT EVOLUTION**, it is the *opposite*. It is *going the wrong way*. Show us a species that is *coming* or an organ that is *in the making*. Show us how to grow wings where there are none.

Any false theory is half damned if stated in simple words. It is all damned if forced to be consistent. It is twice damned when you take off its parade uniform and make it work.

VERBAL SMOKE SCREENS

Get this, if you can. "Evolution is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, through a process of differentiations and integrations," which means that a vague somehow-or-other can't-stick-together all-alike-ness is changed to an easily described hang-together-ness that is unlike anything that is different, through a process of separating for cause and combining for convenience. The wonder is, so many people take it seriously. Evolution means to *unroll*. Any schoolboy knows that the more you unroll a thing, the smaller it gets. The famous phrase—"The survival of the fittest"—has for years been relied upon to explain the process of evolution. It sounds pretty, and seems pious, but what it really means is—"Might makes right." "Dog eat dog." "Root hog or die." "The weak to the wall." With such a theory, "modernists" propose a compromise—"Let us slip God in somewhere, and you may evolve the Bible also." The scholar who believes the "fact" of evolution, doubts the infallibility of the Bible. I know of no exception.

CHANGE OF FRONT

If evolution was God's plan in the past, it ought to be good now. If applied to society today, it would mean—let the weaklings starve, eat your enemies, practice polygamy and encourage old people to die.

KALEIDOSCOPIC.

I am told that Darwinism has been abandoned and that I am fifty years behind the times in fighting it. I know it. The latest confessed scientist is ever chasing his predecessors off the stage. The next generation will make fun of what we now call science. That is why it is not really science.

TRUTH NOT AT WAR WITH TRUTH.

Now I do not resist any real science for a moment, nor do I find the Scriptures in conflict with any truth. By the Holy Scriptures, I mean the original writings accepted by Christ and his church. The old "chestnut" that the church resisted proof that the world is round, is neither analogous nor wholly true. When the circle of the earth was proven, the church looked for it in the Bible and found it there. Jesus clearly warned the world that when he comes, it will be night one place, daytime another place. That the earth is round, is easily demonstrated; that Eve was not made from a rib, never has been proven, and in the nature of the case never can be proven. Nor can it be shown that God did not make Adam from dust, without the help, permission or connivance of apes then or critics now.

ROMANS 11:34.

To know what God *did not* do is to know what he *could not* or *would not* do. This means that the custodian of a pate full of brains, whose life is less than a passing grain in the hour glass of God, assumes an infallibility in discovering the fallibility of the Book. It amounts to saying to "Him that sitteth on the throne," "Sit over!" It means that animated dust presumes to sit as a high court and pass upon the revelation of God. A dispute over a line fence cannot be settled in an honest court, without sworn testimony, yet critics, without oath, impeach the testimony of the Bible *out of court*.

"GOOD" AND "VERY GOOD"

We admit that Adam was made by the same maker to eat, drink, and breathe the same elements and weather the same storms. We admit that he was meant to be an improvement on anything previously made. Genesis says God inspected his work and four times pronounced it "good." After that he made man and pronounced his work "very good." All the unidentified bones that were ever dug up or imagined could only show that God did not need to make a great change in his "good" to make his "very good."

THE FIRST CRITIC

If all the brute markings that evolutionists are so eager to find in themselves, are conceded just to please the brotherhood, yet they can only show what man *is* since the fall, not what he was before "all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth." According to Genesis, some creature called Nachash (Hebrew word) was "more subtle than any beast of the field that Jehovah God had made." I do not know who he was, nor what he looked like before he was cursed with serpent shape, but he used language, founded the society of Y. H. G. S. (Yea, hath God said?), posed as a critic of the Word of God, qualified as an educator and had a seed that made trouble for the Adamic race. If he had maintained a copyright on his philosophy, we should now be spared the claim that it is "modern" thought and "new" conception.

ALL FLESH CORRUPT.

Later, it is reported that visitors or neighbors who were not proper mates for the chosen race, intermarried with them to the great grief and anger of God. Even animals were involved in the fearful corruption of all flesh. "There were nephilim in the earth in those days." I do not know who any of these trouble makers were, but they may have left a few bones for the collectors to use in making an uncle or grandpa for Adam.

PAPER AND INK RACES.

With a bone, a belief and a bottle of ink, the confessed experts have peopled the prehistoric wilderness with bull-necked, fish-mouthed races that fit into the scheme as desired. They pause in their labors to deny that God could make even one lone man by himself. Verily when men begin to doubt the Bible, they believe what they wish to believe.

TESTIMONY OF THE DUST.

If evolution is true, man ought to be vastly improved physically, but man is the sickest thing on earth. If culture is what the race needs, the schools ought to have vastly improved his morals, but poison gas, bombs, Bolshevism, Bohemianism, white slavery and birth control seem to thrive in civilization even better than in savagery. The dust of a thousand buried cities witness of man's experiments and mark the inevitable end of the trail that leads *from* the Garden of Eden.

AN ALIBI FOR SIN.

There is no logical place for inbred sin in evolution, hence its devotees have substituted the epigrams—"If man ever fell, he fell upward." "The sin in the Garden of Eden was the effort of an ape to become a man." "God made man, but he used a monkey to gather the dirt." Such of the Bible as they cannot misconstrue to fit their fancy, they discredit by calling it "Hebrew conception," "folk lore," "tribal psychology" and "the phantasmagoria of undeveloped minds." Sin, the stinking cancer and rotting leprosy of society, is called "arrested development." If there is a personal God, they admit he may be annoyed. Well's Outline of History says of a war-lord who drenched Europe with blood—"God was bored with him."



WHAT WORRIES THE CRITICS.

The only trouble the critics have, who would save enough

of the Bible for sick beds and funerals, is to decide where the blue pencil is to stop now that it is well started. If the God of Genesis is only a "tribal god," the God of John's gospel may be only John's notion of God. If the Garden of Eden is a myth, heaven may go to the scrap pile next. If the virgin birth is in doubt, the resurrection is under suspicion. If some miracles must go, which ones may stay? Ask some "modernist." If he does not dodge, he must answer like the bishop who denied all miracles and classed Christ with Santa Claus. If the Bible is mistaken in telling us from whence we came, how can we trust it to tell us where we are going? How much will be left to assure the little mother with bent form and broken heart, that

"In the morn those angel faces smile
Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile."

Consistency is not to be expected of spoon-fed prophets who find the Bible must be skimmed, strained and diluted to fit their digestion, but to those who think through to logical conclusions, it is obvious that the dictator who will furnish God an alibi in Genesis will have his resignation ready for him in Revelation. The unbelief that makes the first Adam a "sport," will not balk much if the second Adam is denied a legitimate birth. If each man may sift the Bible for himself and throw away anything which he thinks is Babylonian tradition, Rabbinical interpolation, Grecian influence and Pauline narrowness, *constitutional government will be next to go*. When the masses learn to sniff at the authority of the Word of God, they will snort at the authority of man-made laws. The critics shall yet be more anxious to stop the flood than they were to start the leak.

EITHER SIN OR EVOLUTION IS TO BLAME

After the Nachash beguiled mother Eve with his "new theology," man tried to get away from God even as he does today. Later, the race took another plunge into depravity by some sort of cross breeding and God uses ten expressions in six verses, to record his grief, disgust and disappointment.

There is no place in the story for metaphor to make it mean exactly the opposite from what it says. There is no room for exegetical fog on which to paint evolutionary rainbows. Either it is the truth or it is a pitiful, palpable lie. Better burn the Bible, than make it a dunghill of superstition in which God has been pleased to hide some grains of corn which may be discovered by critical scratching. If Bible embellishers can calmly survey the lust, treachery and hell of horror that has followed, and not see that something has happened to God's plan; if all the hideous nightmare of cruelty is only God's method of making a frog into an angel; then heaven is on the far side of hell and no detour. If for a thousand ages of inferno, there was only hate without mercy, brute force without pity, plunder without remorse, while God worked with his dirt; if, in all the teeming wilderness, there was no prayer but the scream of terror, no answer but the hush of death as the jaws of the killer dripped with blood; is not the new theology overworking the love side of its religion? (No answer.)



DEVIL NEEDED TO EXPLAIN.

If there is no devil, there needs to be one to account for the overflowing devilry of earth. If after all the committees on social uplift have experimented for 6,000 years with the mess the apes left on their hands and the most favored nation leads the world in crime, divorce, prizefights, chorus girls, commercialized sport, cliques, dope and birth control; if with our university halos, a prizefight or a barbecue has ten times the drawing power of a bishop, isn't it about time to let the apes mix up another batch? In every display of samples of what evolution is doing for man in this decade, the system **backfires**. So far is it from God's plan that death shall be the twin angel of life and the brood mother of progress, that he says—"The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." When his kingdom comes; when the "prince of this world"

Fourteen

is banished, God will restore Eden conditions and the "Lamb and the lion shall lie down together."

BUDDHISM FITS

Buddhism is the only religion that fits evolution, for it proposes to breed out with a thousand reincarnations, what evolution says has been bred in on the journey from tadpole to man. Does it seem reasonable that God would take years as numberless as the stars to build the frail human body that goes back to dust in a few years, and then in the twinkling of an eye, "when they that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God," call it back to an endless life? Better the faith of ignorance than the folly of wisdom.

NEW CLOTHES FOR OLD THOUGHTS.

The miracles and "days of vengeance" in the Bible have always fretted the men who make programs for God. They would limit his power and tone down his wrath by exalting human reason above revelation. Of late, they would overawe us with a display of scholarship and rescue us from the "outworn portions" of the Bible. They have much to say of "new" knowledge and "freedom of thought." This heroic talk is, after all, but the remouthing of the "outworn portions" of Ingersoll, Paine and Voltaire. The only thing new about the movement that I can see is that the attack is *from the inside*. Every bloody handed anarchist who ever threw a bomb was for "unshackled thought" and free thinkers and free lovers can say amen. How often in life the masses are confused and "bunk" passes for heroics. What and where is this free thought? In all nature, that marvelous something or somewhat that we call instinct guides the thoughts of the dumb-creatures and guides them well. Among humans, it is well known that the mother imposes her thought characteristics upon the child *before it is born*. If she is a good mother, she determines in a great measure the content, habits and direction of the child's thought after it is born. True freedom of

thought would mean to be hatched in an incubator and kept solitary in a brooder the remainder of life. Even at that, instinct and experience might force one's thoughts into certain channels. What are schools and teachers for, if not to amend and direct thought? Freedom of thought in school is about as practical as freedom of weeds in the garden. The freest thought in the world is that brought "into captivity to the obedience of Christ." (2 Cor. 10:5). The meanest freedom in the world is that which denies that God was free to do as he pleased.

FREEDOM TO MOULD OTHER MINDS.

Any man may indulge in a veritable riot of thinking as he pleases and no one would be the wiser. The ones making the fuss about their freedom to think are the very ones most anxious to impose their thoughts upon others. What they really seek is freedom of propaganda. They wish to teach in schools and churches paid for and kept up by believers and shape plastic minds in moulds of unbelief. If some mariner wishes to abolish the stars and sail by a lantern that he hangs in the rigging, he may do so, but not with my boat or my boy. The hoax of the barnyard is the setting of duck's eggs under a hen. Even so, a man eager to make a stir in the world, may warm the imported eggs of rationalism and thenceforth ask only for freedom to cluck and scratch. A close observer may often know what professors a man studied under by *hearing him talk*. One may fairly guess the literature a preacher reads, by hearing his sermons. Sometimes I wonder if there may not be false parrots as well as false prophets. I freely confess regret for originality. What I work out that is not wrought in by the Spirit, God send that it may be short lived. God grant that all who have been joined to Christ "that we might bring forth fruit unto God," (Rom. 7:4) may be spared the shame of incubating the eggs of some intellectual cuckoo. *God needs no one to do his thinking for him*, any more than a sawmill needs a woodpecker to make shingles.

life has evolved for hundreds of millions of years from amoeba to man because each "higher" form was better able to survive than the one beneath it.

What spoils this "bedtime story" is the fact that stubborn "lower" forms persist where the "higher" forms cannot. Is it the truth or a lie, that numberless billions of one-celled creatures can be dried up, frozen up, buried in the mud or blown away and come right back and do business?

Ask any school boy who has studied biology.

Of course there is an element of truth in this survival theory. Old mammy toad will leave a thousand eggs in a pool. Averages indicate that only one can live to the second year. Now it is obvious that if one little tadpole can outwit all the foes and get all the food when there is only enough for one, he has quite the best chance to make his mother a grandma.

But, the spryest little fellow may be the one first within reach of a foe. The most cautious one may be the one that goes without its dinner. With death lurking on four sides, above and below, I will pick the average tadpole for the winner. If they were more helpless or stupid a million years ago, it is difficult to understand how any of them lived.

No doubt if black and white rabbits were turned loose to run wild, they would in time breed back to a common color that was protective, and that is about all that "survival" can do for them. Some student will say, "Surely, the fastest rabbits will survive and raise the average of speed." This seems plausible until you consider that their natural foes use strategy and stealth as much as speed. Speed in a rabbit begets overconfidence and does damage when it makes short turns in the briars.

Now suppose this survival theory could add speed, size, and sagacity, that would not be evolution because the rabbit would still be a rabbit. If "survival" could give the rabbit an equipment like a skunk, that would be evolution for the rabbit, but it would be EVIL-ution for everything else. Imagine, if you can, how soon other life would be driven out. Now evolution has had millions of years (they say) and millions of chance to develop in some creature an equipment that would destroy competitors, but each form of life has enough equipment and not too much. It would take a board of scien-

tists a thousand years to figure out so nice a balance as we see in nature. Would evolution do that?

It is a vital part of the law of "survival" that no creature can develop an equipment that hinders it or helps its foes. Is that true professor?

If the so called "higher" forms of life are so handicapped in the struggle for food and mates and progeny and against fire, frost, famine, flood and foes that "lower" forms are not quickly driven out, then it argues that they were created that way. Never mind what some propagandist say about it, use your common sense. You can see that one bird lays but one egg, another 16. One animal is short on speed, another on wit, another on defense, another on the variety it can eat, another on progeny, so that a wonderful balance is preserved. (Job. 39:17).

I quite agree with evolutionists that water life appeared first. The Bible says so. We believe it pleased God to create life in the order he did. The evolutionist must begin as near nothing as possible so that it will minimize the miracle of getting the first life and not overwork the necessity of creation. Having presumed one invisible life, the next thing to presume is that through all the ages nature put a premium on the more complicated forms and gave a bonus of life and progeny to those that developed brain, speed, defense, etc.

That is exactly what evolution would do if evolution were a fact.

THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT HAS NOT BEEN DONE BECAUSE IT IS NOT A FACT.

Every advantage has some corresponding handicaps, disproving evolution.

On this proposition I am willing to stake the fight.

Let us begin at the beginning.

There is a greatly magnified picture of a little bag of soup that they say started the trouble. The first figure shows the little ancestor getting ready to have a puckering in its equator. Figure 2 shows the furniture divided and moved, half in each end. Figure 3 shows it broken in two without hurting it. How it could know when to move the furniture or how to move it or where to move it, when it has not brains or nerves, we do not know. Since there must be heredity, variation and survival to get evolution started, will the professor kindly advise

THE BORROWED HAT.

Evolution has been likened to a magician who borrows a hat and before a wondering audience takes out of it only *what he puts into it*. The show is a success because the spectators fail to catch him at the trick. Continuing the parable, the evolutionist makes a good showing by diverting your attention to something else, while he adds to his collection of wonders that he will presently take out of his theory. He will divert your attention to what he calls laws, till he slips *life* into the hat and then show you the life while he puts in the *laws*. Law begets life and then life begets law. The first life is presumed to be very insignificant and so small that a billion of them could live in a thimble. Nevertheless it is life that no one but God understands, and without which God could not exist nor the universe be known. Little as it is, it has the greatest program thrust upon it of any life short of God himself. It must *unroll* till earth and sky and heaven and hell are full, *if faith and foolishness are twins*.

ABSTRACT LAW.

What is law? Darwin said it "is the observed sequence of events." It sounds profound, but no one was there to *observe* and there was no *sequence* of events until there were *two* events in the life of the inexperienced germ. If there could be two events in this first life without law, then law did not order the events. Unless logic is turned topsy turvy, that law was there waiting for life, or the life could proceed without the law. There is no law apart from a law giver any more than there is a bung-hole without a barrel or a cipher with the rim knocked off. Something must provide instinct, appetite, food and digestion for the first life and it fools the wayfaring man to say, "law did it." If you inquire what there was to eat before either animal or vegetable life, law must take all responsibility.

STARTERS AND STOPPERS.

Fully equipped inside and out and able to get his own

living, the first baby "ancestor" was infinitely better fixed than human babies who are the most helpless things on earth. That little "forefather" ought to have been satisfied and never have started something we have been quite unable to finish. If it had been content to hold its own, what a peaceful world this had been, but it introduced a revolution without precedent—a miracle *if it happened but once*. It began to *grow*. It had no need to grow for it was meeting its environment perfectly. Besides, growth would in time make it so large that the earth would be lopsided. It must *stop* growing. Wonderful, that a *stopper* should come along at the right time. Then happened an event as wonderful as that which befell Adam; only when it happened to Adam, it couldn't happen because it was a miracle. The little invisible speck had a puckering in the middle and without any previous experience, it puckered itself in two. You may call it addition, subtraction, multiplication or division, but *nothing unrolled*.

BEFORE HEREDITY ARRIVES.

Famous evolutionists say that the only factors in evolution are heredity, variety and environment. When a little invisible bubble of soup breaks in two, both ends are the same age and variety and both have the same environment. There is nothing that could put a tail on one end and horns on the other, and if there was, yet the immediate breaking in two would leave both ends crippled. Each half is the other end of the other half and never in eternity can evolution jump the gap between the cell without sex and parents, and the creatures of sex and parents. If sex gets started, someone must start it.

THE FIRST "ANCESTORS" REFUSE TO DIE.

Right here, the famous law of the survival of the fittest breaks down hopelessly. Even a half wit must see that according to this law, *anything that survives must be the fittest*. All about us are "squintillions" and "squidrillions" of

one-celled germs just like the one that is presumed to have started the trouble. They are able to survive *where we cannot*. They can live in water, ice, air or dust, and for years at a time without food. Since they are the "survivingest" little survivors the world has ever known, then they are the fittest and nothing else had a license to survive.

THE IMPASSABLE GULF.

Sex is a most necessary factor in the theory of evolution, but they cannot get it into life with any laws that they acknowledge. Their laws would *keep it out*. It could not come by accident, since the mental and material equipment necessary to each sex, would fill a catalog and a whole flock of accidents at the same time would be necessary. It could not help anything survive that *had been* surviving before, and *has been* surviving since. It would be a positive *handicap* to creatures that could multiply by merely breaking in two. Sex is an intricate maze of mystery that hides its puzzle beyond the barriers where human reason breaks down. What the unrollers need is a Santa Claus to bring it down the chimney, ready to function, with all its instincts, affinities, jealousies, penalties and rewards. Then, and not till then, can the evolutionist bring his trick rules to bear. He cannot get what *he calls* his fittest, to survive until he gets it to *arrive*.

TRICK RULES.

"Only grandma can make me mind," said a willful child.

"How does grandma do it?"

"She tells me to do what she tells me, *or not* do it."

Thus the evolutionists have made their rules so that they will work three speeds ahead and *reverse*. If God Almighty was to make outright and forthwith, a new creature of flesh with bone or no bone, red blood, white blood, hot blood, cold blood, rig it out with electric lights, artillery, umbrella and any instrument in the orchestra; they would fence it in with

rules and shoo it into their menagerie. Here are some of the rules abbreviated:

- I. Be like your ancestors or be different.
- II. The fittest shall survive and the unfit may live.
- III. Grow big or stay little; either will help you to survive or not.
- IV. That your family may survive, lay a million eggs or give birth to one.
- V. Unused organs shall disappear or persist.
- VI. Rudimentary organs are what you have had or what you will have.
- VII. Win a mate by combat or not; it will help the family survive, or not.
- VIII. Polygamy will help survival, unless you prefer to mate in pairs.
- IX. Fight your neighbors or unite with them; one way or the other will help.
- X. Wear gaudy colors or avoid display, so shall your family survive.
- XI. Develop legs, wings, tail, horns, shells or not; they will help, or not.
- XII. Remember, it's a THEORY. Don't let any man see you MAKING wings out of warts or Adams out of apes.

WHAT UPSETS DARWINISM.

If the fairies or "Lady Luck" or the great god Jupiter will donate sex to sexless creatures, the birth, rearing and scattering of a family will, without doubt, modify within limits. With the family taken for granted, the mind that takes things for granted will not see the *fatal blunder* of letting the family business proceed recklessly. It must be personally conducted or destroy itself. The codfish is said to lay 10 million eggs and the elephant to give birth to one in 10 years, yet there are enough elephants and none too many codfish. If the birds of prey hatched 16 like the quail or many pairs each year like the pigeon, things would go to

smash, for it is conceded that without worm eating birds, most life would speedily vanish from the earth. Someone must line up the parade. If the worms arrive five years ahead of the worm eaters, the earth will become a desert. Evolutionists say the worms arrived some millions of years ahead of the birds. The first worms may have been *good worms* and lived on scraps. All the *starters* and *stoppers* must get here at exactly the right time; must be numerous or few; must be long lived or short lived; just right to preserve the balance and ballast of things. If vegetation did not give off oxygen, if animal life did not give off carbon dioxide no life would be possible.

HANDICAP.

Evolutionists admit that nothing could possibly develop in a creature that works against it, yet HANDICAP is everywhere in evidence. If left to the alleged laws of evolution, the house fly might have a bite like a tarantula, a sting like a hornet, the appetite of a mosquito and the artillery of a skunk. If an invisible germ can bring swift death to the unsuspecting, surely the more highly developed (if they are) should be a thousand times more deadly. If evolution is true, *only a continuous miracle could keep it from destroying itself*. All destroyers are handicapped so that "fish worms" hold their own about as well as hen hawks.

There is a germ called botulinus bacillus that produces a toxin, a spoonful of which is enough to destroy all human life. Fortunately it is more rare than yeast germs. The great monsters of prehistoric times have disappeared, to our great comfort. The reverent student of nature will thank God for holding evil in check now, even as he believes the promise that God will some day banish it.

THE DIZZY CIRCUIT.

With law, luck or lingo the theorist explains everything. He can argue that certain factors are the cause of evolution or that they are caused by evolution. It depends on which

you wish explained. Like a dog chasing his tail, the dog makes the tail go, and the tail makes the dog go, depending on which end of the dog you wish explained. It is the unwritten law of evolution that EVOLUTION WILL PRODUCE ANYTHING THAT WILL PRODUCE EVOLUTION.

REGISTERED STOCK.

There are several pedigrees thrust upon us by so-called science. I give below the one prepared by the Jordon-Kellogg School because they are considered high authorities. I doubt not that there are others more recent and will be another one next year; all of them *temporarily* scientific.

READ UP.

Man.

Anthropoids.

Old World monkeys.

Lemurs.

Marsupials (like opossums).

Reptiles (related to 2 eyed lizards).

Amphibians (the frog family).

Lung bearing fish (as the fringed ones).

Sharks.

Lamprey or Lanceet (something like an eel).

Worms.

Hydra or Volvox. Hydra is like a piece of macaroni with spaghetti trimmings. Volvox resembles a ball of green jelly with whiskers.

Amoeba (able to project limbs from the body and withdraw them).
Phan.

Twenty-Four

By this list it is apparent that we had limbs aplenty and at will in the second chapter and exchanged them for quite other trimmings in the third. On the fourth floor we had worm legs which vanished in the fifth. Fins appeared during the fifth or sixth experiment and went out of style in the eighth. A swim-bladder came in style about the same time



and went out about a million years ahead of the fins. We have had four kinds of a tail that has served as propeller, rudder, guy-rope, swing and hitching strap. If they will tell us what we are to get in the next distribution, a million years hence, we may forgive evolution for the mean tricks it has played on us.

ARE WE FITTER NOW?

Once we could live in water or on the land. Once we had cold blood and could winter in the cold mud without food. Once we could leave a case of eggs in the water or sand and let the census taker do the worrying. Later, when warm blooded babies came in style, our marsupial mothers tucked them away in a large vest pocket and never a baby cried. Think of the good old days before handkerchiefs and soap were needed.

WHAT A FARMER BOY KNOWS.

The originator of the brotherhood explained some of the changes listed above by the sifting process of survival. In explaining the development of color and song in birds, they adopt a *contrary* law. They presume that the female bird selected the mate with the color and song to her taste. It is characteristic of false theories that they *make* more problems than they solve. Miss Blackbird is so "persnickerty" that she selects a mate with a splotch of red on his shoulder and *nowhere* else, (scarcely visible except in flight). At the same time, the male is particular to choose *only a bride who lays eggs with Chinese laundry marks on them*. The marvel of

eternity will be: *What "fool stuff" men believe, who doubt the Bible.* Why should the common hen in her wild state, choose a noisy flaming colored mate who would invite trouble from birds and beasts of prey? Would that help them survive? As a matter of fact, the hen does not do the choosing. This theory was adopted to avoid the evidence of *design* in creation, which they admitted would destroy their hypothesis. Putting the responsibility on the female or on survival of the fittest utterly fails when you inquire why there is evident design in the beauty of bird's eggs, mollusks and even in the leaves of the trees. Why should young birds bear beautiful markings not like either parent? Why should the worker bee which has no real sex, be unlike either parent? I have just examined a small caterpillar under a microscope. No circus parade was ever more gorgeous in display; no work of art more dainty in design. The color was not protective and caterpillars *do not choose mates.*

IT PUZZLED DARWIN.

If God did not plan that each kind of creature should have its own marks of identity in voice, color, shape, habits, instincts, tastes and handicaps, then it is certain that sex selection or survival could not do it. Why should a rabbit make a track like the letter Y? What law would put rattles on a snake's tail? What pinch of necessity would give a turkey gobbler a whiplash on his nose, ugly meat beads on his neck and a paint brush on his breast? When the theorists explain the utility of the crowing of a rooster, they never tell you why he crows *at night*. Why is it that of all the kinds of creatures, no two kinds taste or smell alike?

RECKLESS WITH MILLIONS

Evolutionists rely much on the study of fossils, and since it is out of reach of common people, poorly supported theories pass for facts. When this is written, the latest report on bones is published in the Scientific American, May, 1923.

It says: "We must then trace our genealogy and that of the apes back 2,000,000 years before we come to a common meeting point." Speaking of bones, they say: "Those of the few discoveries of men and ape-like men more than 50,000 years old, could be placed in a handbag." They admit that some of these bones are in doubt. As a matter of fact, the bones may be those of an idiot, a freak, or a beast; or they may have been "planted" as a clever hoax, as some bones have turned out to be.

THE CONFESSION.

The first one dealt with is called "*Pithecanthropus erectus*" and might as properly be called "*Evolvo-spoof-us*" as they only have the top of the skull. With one bone they have actually made a photograph of him from the waist up. More daring cartoonists have even made pictures of his big toe that pass for scientific. With only the top piece of the skull, they know that his nose was flat, that his chin was short and that he had a gentle eye and a bull neck. Of the "*Heidelberg man*," they have nothing but a jawbone. Because it is narrow, they decide that he could not speak a language, all of which proves that a *parrot cannot talk at all*. Even a goose-bone prophet would not presume so recklessly. Do you believe that with a hat full of bones (take this either way you wish) they can bridge the gulf of nearly two million years? Are you convinced that these supposed races were our ancestors? Then here is a cruel jolt. They say of four races represented by these bones, that they "**LEFT NO DESCENDANTS.**"

CHILDLESS "ANCESTORS".

After all the hullabaloo, after millions had accepted them as ancestors, it is now decided that they *left no descendants* and have passed out of existence without apparent reason. In their place we have Mutt and Jeff and Barney Google. Such artists as these, who can reconstruct a hypothetical race from an unidentified bone would like to give

your Bible a "scientific" tinkering. One of their drum majors says, "Everything has evolved, from molecule to Jehovah." "Man is not a fallen god, but a promoted reptile."

FISH GILLS FIFTY MILLION YEARS OLD.

Because there are three wrinkles on the head of the partly developed unborn child, they jump at the conclusion that they are "gill slits." Against this presumption, I argue that they do not look like fish gills; they are not in the right place for gills; if our ancestors ever had gills, there is no reason why they should not have kept them for us; whatever may be the reason for these wrinkles, they are necessary to the development of the child. It is a claptrap and flapdoodle philosophy, that will read into the fathomless mystery of unborn life, the markings of a fish, that they say lived fifty million years ago.

SEE FOR YOURSELF.

Another fairy tale is that our ancestors once squatted on a limb when it rained and held their hands over their heads as an umbrella. Now after two million years, they say the hair on the arms slants the way the water used to run. You may easily prove the folly of this by observing that the hair on the forearm slants around the arm as though the ancestors drove an open automobile in the rain. The hair on the lower limbs would indicate that there were no floor boards and the splash of mud turned the hair towards the hips. Even so it is better to be a fool in your right mind than to be a wise man drunk with infidel philosophy.

* * * * *

UNDER FIRE

A certain gathering of pastors and laymen listened to the foregoing paper somewhat abridged and offered sharp criticism both in public and in private. Though three previous gatherings had applauded eight papers which presented the opposite views, the chief objection offered was that it is unwise to discuss these matters in public.

Those who know how the so-called modernist theories have been thrust, thinly disguised, into Sunday school literature and taught to sleeping children, will need no answer. It is enough to say that if a defense of the unity and integrity of the Holy Scriptures, before Christians, will start a scrimmage there is a conflict long overdue.

Objection 2. If youthful minds are taught that faith is at variance with science, they will later accept science and abandon faith.

This has been answered repeatedly. We do not question the findings of science, but the flat of alleged scientists. There is no possible chance that anyone can ever show that God did not make man from the dust. If there were other beings like men; if God followed closely a pattern already found practical; if the human body was modified somewhat when "all flesh had corrupted his way"; if any one of several hypotheses is considered; then the evidence in man himself is on the side of Genesis. Whatever men guess, only God gives testimony concerning the first man in his image.

Objection 3. Most of the scholars have accepted the theory of evolution.

Many or few, the word accepted is well chosen. Not one in a thousand could take the witness stand and testify from personal observation and investigation. The veracity of the Scriptures is not to be impeached by counting noses or hearsay testimony. Of an event remote in time, never repeated and wholly beyond observation, a fool can give as competent testimony as a philosopher, since neither one was there. At the risk of seeming profane, I will say that scholarship has often been mistaken and is agreed now only on what is easily demonstrated. A free acting Omnipotent God has probably not kept within the limits they have set for him.

Objection 4. Who cares how we came, if we know where we are going?

As well might a gypsy fortune teller ask: "Who cares how many lies I have told in the past, if I tell you what you wish to hear now?" There are but two possible sources of information concerning a life beyond the grave—revelation and necromancy. If the revelation we incline to is sadly mixed with fable and fiction, the spirit medium will come into authority as the Bible held upon the people is loosened (and she has). If you are satisfied that science has discredited the Garden of Eden story, bear in mind, it has not confirmed life beyond the grave. "Begone miracle story! Hurrah for heaven!" is an idiotic slogan.

Objection 5. Why worry about critics? Let God take care of the Bible.

He will. Thus they taunted the dying Christ. When God answered, not one stone of the temple was left upon another. If aweless critics will read the handwriting of God in the dust of buried cities, they may surmise that the hand that wrote on Babylon's palace wall, may yet write for us.

Objection 6. You have failed utterly to discuss Christian evolution.

This is the tragedy; that a man called to be the prophet of God cannot see that in all the assumed billion years of evolution when it was helpful for the weak to go down before brute force and cunning, there was nothing that remotely resembled "the meekness and gentleness of Christ," who ministered to the poor and sick while he heaped woes upon the indifferent upper classes. Evolution is not Christianity; it is Nietzscheism. Nietzsche hated Christianity because it "glorified sympathy, tenderness, mercy, which are weaknesses and hindrances to power." If you can imagine moral devilry and a heavenly hell, then may we conceive of "Christian" evolution.

Objection 7. If God is not ex—ah—relieved from responsibility for the crude notions and barbarous teaching of the Old Testament, the finer spirits of the new day will be repelled.

If, after identifying himself with the Bible for thousands of years, Jehovah is now ashamed of himself or it, let him make his own apologies. Surely the "super-men" who turned Europe into a seething hell in this generation are not the ones to direct his reformation.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Ought not religion to adjust itself to science?

There are no adjusters on true religion or real science. If you have enough big words, you can label anything "science." For a few thousand dollars you can hire a battery of "scientists" to testify under oath to the effect that the bigger devil a criminal is, the less he is to blame. One of the last babies the devil had, he called his middle name "Science." Hear a parable. Once there was a boy rode a broomstick. He said "Choo choo" and whistled at the crossings. He went so fast the telephone poles couldn't keep up. Man-made religion may follow the band-wagon and leave the oracles of God behind, for all I care, but the faith on which I stake my soul must be constant. Lightning bugs are scientists in their own sphere; they know how to do some things better than I do, but I want the stars, in the "valley of the shadow." "Scientists" have changed their pronouncements so many times that they ought to be lenient with us if we wait until they agree on just what tinkering our Bible needs and stay agreed for 10 years. I cannot face eternity with an opinion and a smile. Fog-horns make poor anchors in a storm.

Is the Bible story of creation reasonable?

God is in no way bound to keep on the level of human reason warped with sin, conceited in its ignorance. As compared with the events of nature that baffle human reason, Genesis is marvelously reasonable.

The first verse announces heavens and earth **ALREADY MADE**. "In the beginning" may include the back end of eternity. The "days" that followed were certainly God's days, for man had not appeared with his sunrise and sunset. The mighty pendulum of God does not mark time with the tick tick of man.

Whether the second verse describes a new world steaming hot or a watery waste where continents had blown up and gone down, in either case the earth would have a blanket of fog, gas and smoke a hundred miles deep, and darkness would be "on the face of the deep." After God's secretary wrote it, it took science 4,000 years to find it out. The Spirit (also translated wind) of God moved on the face of the waters and when God said, "Let there be light," the cooling process condensed some of the fog and washed the sky until light peeped through. "And there was a period of obscurity and coming forth, one day." (This is a free translation, warranted, I believe, by the Hebrew.)

During the second period the fog continued to clear until there

was an expanse (Hebrew) or clear space between sea and clouds. Reasonable, isn't it?

Next, the crust of the earth heated up just as we know it has done hundreds of times, and where land appeared, vegetation covered it.

During the fourth period, the clouds had condensed until sun and moon were LIGHTS in the firmament. The sun is not a light any place until its rays get there. The sun and moon were made "in the beginning"; they were lights in the base of the sky when the clouds were this enough. The words "He made" applied to stars, are not in the Hebrew.

Water life, birds and land animals, appeared in the fifth and sixth days in the EXACT order that geology reveals. Wonderful Book! It reported accurately 3,000 years before worldly wise men abandoned the fool stories they had believed, such as the earth hatching out of an egg, or being a hump on the back of a turtle.

It is reasonable that God could not be satisfied with all this, and he made man in his own image—moral consciousness, communion with God and eternity in his heart. Though that image has been sadly marred, God's invitation is to come back, not blunder ahead.

TO FRIENDS

Are you a comrade in this fight? Read this.

It costs us (average) 16c to find a customer for a 24c book. We could have used thicker paper, wider margins, larger type, cloth cover, and charged \$1.50 for these books. We put the price very low and these books are going round the world. At the time this edition is printed, it has been a losing venture, but it will win. Over against the wealth of anti-Bible "Christianity," the believers in a miracle working God will stand together. If you like these books, speak of them in your letters; tell your friends about them; take them to conventions and camp meetings.

For distribution or sale by agents we offer these prices during this edition:

"Jackn-Hor"	To agents and	retailers
"Puddle to	distributors	50c.
"The Tanager"	we send ten	\$1.00 postpaid.
	books of one	
	kind, postpaid,	also 12 for \$1.00 postpaid.
	for \$1.00.	

(Not Rem)